

Remarks

The Applicants have carefully considered the Office Action mailed March 6, 2008. After such consideration, independent Claims 1; 15; and 20 have been amended, dependent Claims 4; 17; 23-25, 27, 30 and 34-35 have been amended, and dependent Claims 2, 3; 12 and 13; 16; 21, 22, 31 and 33 have been cancelled to further distinguish the present invention over the prior art of record. As such, Claims 1, 4-9, 11 and 14; 15 and 17-19; and 20, 23-27, 29-30, 32 and 34-36 remain in the case with none of the claims currently being allowed.

Claims 1-4; 6; 12; 14; 15; 18-22; 24; 30; 32; 35; and 36 were rejected under §102(b) as anticipated by Shelton. In response, independent Claim 1 has been amended to require the vehicle seat include two receptacles for receiving an adaptor, thereby distinguishing the vehicle seat of the present invention over the prior art which presents single channels 30.

Independent Claims 15 and 20 have been amended to include an adaptor with two posts, which is different from the single plate 48 of the cited art.

Applicants respectfully submit that employing two receptacles for two posts is not merely a design choice. Rather, it provides greater stability than using one receptacle with one post. Applicants further point out that this is not merely an obvious variation given the evolution of car seats whereby two-post headrests are standard. Rather, Applicants could have employed only one of the two available receptacles with one post, but greater stability is achieved using both receptacles and two posts.

Currently cancelled dependent Claim 13 contained the two receptacles subject matter of claim 1, and currently cancelled dependent Claims 17 and 33 contained the two posts subject matter of Claims 15 and 20, respectively. Accordingly, no new matter has been introduced by the offered amendments.

In view of the aforementioned amendments, independent Claims 1; 15; and 20, and claims depending therefrom are patentable over Shelton.

Claims 1-5; 12-23; and 30-36 were rejected under §102(e) as anticipated by Seastrom. In response, independent claim 1 was amended to so the posts are directly attached to the bottom surface of the support surface. This overcomes Seastrom, which clearly shows that

bottom surface of support surface 60 is not attached to posts 34. Indeed nothing is attached to bottom surface of support surface 60. Applicants respectfully submit that this is not merely a design choice because positioning the posts on the bottom of the support surface provides greater stability for the peripheral placed on the top surface of the support surface.

Amended independent claim 15 positions the peripheral device above the posts, thereby distinguishing the present invention over Seastrom, wherein the peripheral device is positioned away from the posts, specifically on tab 18 or bar 60. This is not merely a design choice because the “arm design” of Seastrom would dangerously permit the peripheral to bounce and swing while the vehicle is in operation.

Independent Claim 20 was amended to include a continuous side wall connected along the entire length of one of the edges of the support surface. This distinguishes the present invention over the cited art wherein defacto “wall” 26 of Fig. 9 is not connected along the entire length of one of the edges, rather it bisects support 60 (see at least Fig. 8). This is not merely a design choice because the wall of the present invention actually holds the peripheral in position, whereas the “wall” of Seastrom is actually the intersection of overlaying parts with no apparent function.

The substance of the amendments offered in independent Claims 1; 15; and 20 is inherent to originally filed Figs. 4 and 5. No new matter has been introduced.

In view of the aforementioned amendments, independent Claims 1; 15; and 20, and claims depending therefrom are patentable over Seastrom.

Claims 11 and 29 were rejected under §103(a) as unpatentable over Seastrom in view of Yamashita. This rejection is deemed moot in view of the amendments to independent Claims 1 and 20, from which Claims 11 and 29 respectively depend, which provide patentable distinction over Seastrom.

Claims 6-9 and 24-27 were rejected under §103(a) as unpatentable over Seastrom in view of Hall. This rejection is deemed moot in view of the amendments to independent Claims 1 and 20, from which Claims 6-9 and 24-27 respectively depend, which provide patentable distinction over Seastrom.

The Applicants note that multiple claims were amended and cancelled to remove redundancies and otherwise comply with claim drafting convention, as deemed necessary in light of the amendments to the independent claims. No amendments introduced new matter.

The Applicants submit that by this amendment, it has placed the case in condition for immediate allowance and such action is respectfully requested. However, if any issue remains unresolved, Applicant's attorney would welcome the opportunity for a telephone interview to expedite allowance and issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward W. Rilee
Registration No. 31,869
MacCord Mason PLLC
Post Office Box 2974
Greensboro, NC 27402
(336) 273-4422

Date: May 28, 2008
File No.: 8534-001